

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and in view of the reasons that follow. After amending the claims as set forth above, claims 1-10 remain pending in this application.

Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for the careful consideration given to the claims.

Oath/Declaration

The declaration is considered to be defective. A new declaration is being submitted with this Amendment and Reply. For at least this reason, favorable reconsideration of the declaration is respectfully requested.

Information Disclosure Statement

The information disclosure statement (IDS) filed March 24, 2005, is not considered to be an IDS complying with 37 CFR 1.98(a)(2) because a legible copy of each foreign patent and each publication was not provided. It is respectfully submitted that copies of these documents should have been provided directly by WIPO under an exchange program between the PTO, the EPO, and the JPO. However, as a courtesy, copies of the foreign patents and publications are being provided with this Amendment and Reply to expedite prosecution. It is respectfully requested that each reference be considered, and that a copy of the initialed and signed IDS accompany the next Office communication.

Drawings

The drawings are objected to because they fail to show the limitations of claim 7. In order to expedite prosecution, the Applicants have attached hereto new FIGS. 25 and 26 that illustrate the coupling member 18 and the coupling member 31, respectively, being made of a plastically deformable material. FIGS. 25 and 26 finds support, *inter alia*, in the original specification at the paragraph starting at page 26, line 4; the paragraph starting at page 36, line 3; and original claim 7. Applicants have submitted the new figures solely to expedite prosecution and do not believe that these drawings are necessary to understand the invention. For at least this reason, favorable reconsideration of the objection is respectfully requested.

Rejection of claims 2-3, 5, and 7-8 under 35 U.S.C. 112

Claims 2-3, 5, and 7-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph because of the use of the term “the projection” in claims 2-3, 5, and 8, and the recitation of “wherein the sidepiece portions, the bent portions and the curved portion all plastically deform when the first pin is released from the sandwich portions” in claim 7.

Claims 2-3, 5, and 8 have been amended to change “the projection” to “each projection.”

Claim 7 has been amended to depend from claim 6 and recite “wherein at least one of the sidepiece portions, the bent portions and the curved portion has a plastic deformation when the first pin is released from the sandwich portions.”

For at least these reasons, favorable reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Rejection of claims 1 and 5-9 based on Araya

Claims 1 and 5-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 3,847,031 (“Araya”). This rejection is traversed for at least the following reasons.

Claim 1 (as amended) recites “one or more surfaces each disposed between the adjacent projections and opposed to the outside circumferential surface of the first pin at a regular distance.” Araya does not teach or suggest this combination of features. In particular, Araya fails to disclose that a surface disposed between adjacent projections on each of the sandwich portions of the bent portions is opposed to the annular groove 32d of the connecting pin 32 at a regular distance. Indeed, as shown in FIG. 9 of Araya, the entire surface contacts with the annular groove 32d of the connecting pin 32. Thus, Araya does not teach or suggest all the features of claim 1.

Claims 5-9 depend from and contain all the features of claim 1, and are allowable herewith for at least the same reasons as claim 1, without regard to the further patentable features contained therein.

For at least these reasons, favorable reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Rejection of claims 1-9 based on Padrun

Claims 1-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 4,617,775 (“Padrun”). This rejection is traversed for at least the following reasons.

Claim 1 (as amended) recites “sandwich portions supporting a first pin mounted on one of the driving body and the driven body by sandwiching...wherein the first pin is sandwiched between the sandwich portions by inserting the first pin into a spacing between the sidepiece portions and then pressing the first pin toward the bent portion side to deform the bent portions in a direction away from each other.” Padrun does not teach or suggest this combination of features. In particular, Padrun fails to disclose that the reinforcing bar 11 is sandwiched between the sandwich portions by inserting the reinforcing bar 11 into a spacing between the rounded grooves 41 and 48 and then pressing the reinforcing bar toward the confronting side panels (37 and 38) side to deform the confronting side panels in a direction away from each other. Indeed, the reinforcing bar 11 is inserted between the confronting side panels 37 and 38 at the free end side of the confronting side panels 37 and 38, and not from a base end side. (Column 2 lines 38-42 and FIG. 2 of Padrun)

Furthermore, the technical field of Padrun is entirely different from that of the present invention. The invention of claim 1 relates to a coupling member which couples a driven body with a driving body to transmit a driving force of the driving body to the driven body, and cuts off the power transmission when a load for driving the driven body exceeds a given value. (Page 1, lines 6-9 of the present application.) In contrast, the device of Padrun relates to an extensible reinforcing bar assembly for use in reinforcing concrete (see col. 1 lines 5-11 of Padrun). It follows that Padrun does not teach or suggest a first pin mounted on one of the driving body and the driven body because the device of Padrun is from a technical field that is different from driving and driven bodies. Accordingly, Padrun does not teach or suggest all the features of claim 1.

Claims 2-9 depend from and contain all the features of claim 1, and are allowable herewith for at least the same reasons as claim 1, without regard to the further patentable features contained therein.

For at least these reasons, favorable reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Rejection of claims 1, 5-7, and 10 based on Glickman

Claims 1, 5-7, and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 5,427,559 (“Glickman”). This rejection is traversed for at least the following reasons.

Claim 1 (as amended) recites “two or more projections disposed at regular intervals from one another in a circumferential direction of the first pin and contacted with an outside circumferential surface of the first pin; and one or more surfaces each disposed between the adjacent projections and opposed to the outside circumferential surface of the first pin at a regular distance...wherein the first pin is sandwiched between the sandwich portions by inserting the first pin into a spacing between the sidepiece portions and then pressing the first pin toward the bent portion side to deform the bent portions in a direction away from each other.” Glickman does not teach or suggest this combination of features. In particular, Glickman fails to disclose that two or more projections are disposed on each of the sandwich portions of the gripping arms 69 and 70 at regular intervals from one another in a circumferential direction of the shaft element 52 and contacted with the outside circumferential surface of the shaft element 52. Indeed, there are not two or more projections on each of the gripping arms 69, 70 but only one locking projection 72 on each gripping arm. (See FIGS. 9-10 of Glickman.)

Also, Glickman fails to disclose that one or more surfaces each is disposed between the adjacent projections and opposed to the outside circumferential surface of the shaft element 52 at a regular distance. Indeed, there is no surface disposed between adjacent projections and opposed to the outside circumferential surface of the shaft element 52 at a regular distance, on each of the gripping arms 69 and 70 because there are no two projections on each arm. (See FIG. 9 of Glickman.)

Furthermore, Glickman fails to disclose that the shaft element 52 is sandwiched between the sandwich portions by inserting the shaft element 52 into a spacing between sidepiece portions and then pressing the shaft element toward the gripping arms (69, 70) side to deform the gripping arms in a direction away from each other. Indeed, the shaft element 52 is inserted between the gripping arms 69 and 70 at the free end side of the gripping arms 69 and 70, and not from a base end side. (See FIG. 9 of Glickman.) Thus, Glickman does not teach or suggest all the features of claim 1.

Claims 5-7, and 10 depend from and contain all the features of claim 1, and are allowable herewith for at least the same reasons as claim 1, without regard to the further patentable features contained therein.

For at least these reasons, favorable reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Rejection of claims 1, 5-7, and 10 based on Williams

Claims 1, 5-7, and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 6,189,187 (“Williams”). This rejection is traversed for at least the following reasons.

Claim 1 (as amended) recites “sandwich portions supporting a first pin mounted on one of the driving body and the driven body...two or more projections disposed at regular intervals from one another in a circumferential direction of the first pin and contacted with an outside circumferential surface of the first pin; and one or more surfaces each disposed between the adjacent projections and opposed to the outside circumferential surface of the first pin at a regular distance...wherein the first pin is sandwiched between the sandwich portions by inserting the first pin into a spacing between the sidepiece portions and then pressing the first pin toward the bent portion side to deform the bent portions in a direction away from each other.” Williams does not teach or suggest this combination of features. In particular, Williams fails to disclose that, two or more projections are disposed on each of the sandwich portions of the opposing ends 12 at regular intervals from one another in a circumferential direction of the cord 46 and contacted with the outside circumferential surface of the cord 46. Indeed, there is no projection on the opposing ends 12. (See FIG. 1 of Williams.)

Also, Williams fails to disclose that one or more surfaces is disposed between the adjacent projections and opposed to the outside circumferential surface of the cord 46 at a regular distance. Indeed, there is no surface disposed between the adjacent projections and opposed to the outside circumferential surface of the cord 46 at a regular distance, on the opposing ends 12 because there are not two projections on each opposing end. (see FIG. 1).

Furthermore, Williams fails to disclose that the cord 46 is sandwiched between the sandwich portions by inserting the cord 46 into a spacing between the sidepiece

portions and then pressing the cord 46 toward the opposing end (12) side to deform the opposing ends in a direction away from each other. Indeed, the cord 46 is inserted into a cord portion 18 of the opposing end 12 at the free end, i.e., the tabs (26, 28) side of the opposing end 12, and not from a base end side. (See FIG. 2 of Williams.)

Also, the technical field of Williams is entirely different from that of the invention of claim 1. The invention of claim 1 relates to a coupling member which couples a driven body with a driving body to transmit a driving force of the driving body to the driven body, and cuts off the power transmission when a load for driving the driven body exceeds a given value. (See page 1 lines 6-9 of present application.) In contrast, the device of Williams relates to a clip for holding a pair of elongated member portions, such as two portions of an electric cord extending from a power tool. (See column 1, lines 5-7 of Williams.) It follows that Williams does not teach a first pin mounted on one of the driving body and the driven body because the device of Williams is from a technical field that is different from driving and driven bodies. Thus, Williams does not teach or suggest all the features of claim 1.

Claims 5-7, and 10 depend from and contain all the features of claim 1, and are allowable herewith for at least the same reasons as claim 1, without regard to the further patentable features contained therein.

For at least these reasons, favorable reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Rejection of claims 1 and 5-10 based on Thorberg

Claims 1 and 5-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 3,847,031 ("Thorberg"). This rejection is traversed for at least the following reasons.

Claim 1 (as amended) recites "a sandwich portions supporting a first pin mounted on one of the driving body and the driven body...two or more projections disposed at regular intervals from one another in a circumferential direction of the first pin and contacted with an outside circumferential surface of the first pin; and one or more surfaces each disposed between the adjacent projections and opposed to the outside circumferential surface of the first pin at a regular distance...wherein the first pin is sandwiched between the sandwich portions by inserting the first pin into a spacing between the sidepiece portions and then pressing the first pin toward the bent portion side to deform the bent

portions in a direction away from each other.” Thorberg does not teach or suggest this combination of features. In particular, Thorberg fails to disclose that two or more projections are disposed on each of the humps 5 of the forward ends 4 at regular intervals from one another in a circumferential direction of the token and contacted with the outside circumferential surface of the token. Indeed, there is no projection to be contacted with the outside circumferential surface of the token on each of the humps and a token is not sandwiched between the humps. (See FIGS. 1 and 4 of Thorberg.)

Also, Thorberg fails to disclose that one or more surfaces each is disposed between the adjacent projections and opposed to the outside circumferential surface of the token at a regular distance. Indeed, there is no surface disposed between the adjacent projections and opposed to the outside circumferential surface of the token at a regular distance, on each of the humps 5 because there are no two projections on each forward end. (See FIGS. 1 and 4 of Thorberg).

Furthermore, Thorberg fails to disclose that the token is sandwiched between the humps 5 by inserting the token into a spacing between the parallel limbs 3 and then pressing the token toward the forward ends (4) side to deform the forward ends in a direction away from each other. Indeed, a token is not sandwiched between the humps 5. (See FIG. 2 of Thorberg).

Also, the technical field of Thorberg is entirely different from that of the invention of claim 1. The invention of claim 1 relates to a coupling member which couples a driven body with a driving body to transmit a driving force of the driving body to the driven body, and cuts off the power transmission when a load for driving the driven body exceeds a given value. (See page 1 lines 6-9 of the present application.) In contrast, the device of Thorberg relates to a token holder capable of supporting a number of tokens. (See column 1, lines 1-5 of Thorberg.) It follows that Thorberg does not teach a first pin mounted on one of the driving body and the driven body because the device of Thorberg is from a technical field that is different from driving and driven bodies. Thus, Thorberg does not teach or suggest all the features of claim 1.

Claims 5-10 depend from and contain all the features of claim 1, and are allowable herewith for at least the same reasons as claim 1, without regard to the further patentable features contained therein.

For at least these reasons, favorable reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

Applicant believes that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check or credit card payment form being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicant hereby petitions for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

Respectfully submitted,

Date 8/13/2007

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP
Customer Number: 22428
Telephone: (202) 945-6162
Facsimile: (202) 672-5399

By Matthew J. Kremer

Pavan K. Agarwal
Registration No. 40,888

Matthew J. Kremer
Registration No. 58,671